

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant:	NAGDA, et al.	Patent Application	
Application No.:	10/000,121	Group Art Unit:	3629
Filed:	October 31, 2001	Examiner:	Plucinski, J.A.
For:	AN INTEGRATED INFORMATION EXCHANGE SYSTEM FOR MATCHING SHIPPING DEMANDS AND CARRIER AVAILABILITY		

APPEAL BRIEF

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Real Party in Interest	1
Related Appeals and Interferences	2
Status of Claims	3
Status of Amendments	4
Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	5
Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	10
Argument	11
Conclusion	19
Appendix – Clean Copy of Claims on Appeal	20
Appendix – Evidence Appendix	29
Appendix – Related Proceedings Appendix	30

I. Real Party in Interest

The assignee of the present invention is Trimble Navigation Limited.

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals or interferences known to the Appellants.

III. Status of Claims

Claims 1, 3-30, and 33-42 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 2, 31, and 32 have been previously cancelled. This Appeal involves Claims 1, 3-30, and 33-42.

IV. Status of Amendments

All proposed amendments have been entered. An amendment subsequent to the Final Action has not been filed.

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Independent Claims 1, 5, 30, and 34 of the present application pertain to embodiments associated with methods and a system described by the present application. Reference to text (by page and line numbers) of the present application and figure elements (by element reference number) of the present application that describe the claimed embodiments is provided below.

In Claim 1, “[a]n information exchange system” is recited. This embodiment is depicted in and described with reference to Figures 1-15. “[A] link to a communication network coupled to at least one shipper user, at least one carrier user, and a plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: Figure 1 which shows integrated exchange computer 18 coupled via a link with communication network 20 which is coupled with shippers 10, carriers 12, and partner exchanges 14; page 3, line 15 - page 4, line 28; and page 3, lines 21-23 and page 5, lines 28-30 which describe a partner exchange as an entities having a database of shipping demand and/or carrier capacity separate from the database of the integrated exchange system. “[A] database coupled to said link, said database storing a demand entry and a plurality of carrier entries that arrive to said database through said communication network, said demand entry comprising shipping demand specifications and said plurality of carrier entries comprising carrier availability information,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: database 24 of Figure 2; page 6, lines 15-22 (“database 24 holds the posted demands and capacities for shipping”); the Abstract; Claim 1 as originally filed; demand-posting process 50 of Figure 4; bid placement process 60 of Figure 4; page 8, line 8 - page 9, line 12; Figures 4-8 which illustrate demand-posting via a web interface; and Figures 10 and 11 which

illustrate bidding (input of carrier availability information). “[A] logic unit coupled to said database, said logic unit receiving said demand entry, automatically selecting one of said plurality of carrier entries based on an attribute of said demand entry, and automatically booking said selected carrier entry in response to said demand entry,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: logic unit 22 of Figure 2; page 6, lines 15-22 (“Logic unit 22 implements the presentations and functions of the web interface that shippers 10 and carriers 12 use”); page 7, lines 14-28; and page 8, line 28 - page 9, line 29. “[A]n application program interface coupled with said link and with said logic unit, said application program interface configured for allowing said logic unit to access said information related to carrier availability from said partner databases,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: application program interface 26 which is coupled with logic 22 in Figure 2; and page 6, lines 15-22. “[A]n integrated exchange computer of said information exchange system, said information exchange computer coupled with said link, wherein said database, said application program interface, and said logic unit are part of said integrated exchange computer,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: integrated exchange computer 18 of Figure 1 and Figure 2; Figure 2 which shows application program interface 26, logic 22, and database 24 as part of integrated exchange computer 18; and page 4, lines 2-16. “[W]herein said partner databases belong to partner exchange entities that are distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system, are registered with said integrated exchange computer, maintain information regarding shipping demand or carrier information separate from said database, and provide access to said information to said integrated exchange computer via said application program interface,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: Claim 2 as originally filed; page 3, lines 16-27; Figure 1 which shows partner exchanges 14 (which include partner databases) as being distinct from

integrated exchange computer 18; page 5, line 28 - page 6, line 10; application program interfaces 15-1 to 15-p of Figure 1; and page 6, lines 15-27 which discuss API 15 coupling with API 26 if integrated exchange computer 18.

Claim 5 depends from Claim 1. “[S]aid logic unit allows a user to define a subgroup within said exchange system and to limit unrestricted access of at least a portion of said database only to members of said subgroup,” as recited in Claim 5, is described at least at: page 5, lines 16-27.

In Claim 30, “[a] method” is recited. This embodiment is depicted in and described with reference to Figures 1 and 2. “[R]eceiving a demand entry from at least one of a first shipper user of an integrated exchange system or one of a plurality of partner databases, said demand entry comprising shipping demand specifications, said demand entry received by a logic unit of an integrated exchange computer of said integrated exchange system,” as recited in Claim 30, is described at least by: page 2, line 27 - page 2, line 2; logic unit 22 of Figure 2; page 6, lines 15-22 (“Logic unit 22 implements the presentations and functions of the web interface that shippers 10 and carriers 12 use”); page 7, lines 14-28; page 8, line 28 - page 9, line 29; demand entry 60 of Figure 4; and Figures 5A, 5B, 6, and 7. “[R]eceiving a first carrier entry from a carrier user of said integrated exchange system and second carrier entry from at least one of said plurality of partner databases, said plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability, said carrier entries received by said logic unit, said carrier entries comprising carrier availability information,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: logic unit 22 of Figure 2; page 6, lines 15-22 (“Logic unit 22 implements the presentations and functions of the web interface that shippers 10 and carriers

12 use”); page 7, lines 14-28; page 8, line 28 - page 9, line 29; Figures 10 and 11 which illustrate bidding (input of carrier availability information); and page 8, line 28 - page 9, line 12. “[S]toring said received demand entry and said received carrier entries in a database comprising a plurality of carrier entries, wherein said database is a part of said integrated exchange computer,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: database 24 of Figure 2; and page 3, lines 21-23 and page 5, lines 28-30 which discuss separate content of partner databases and database 24. “[A]utomatically selecting one of said plurality of carrier entries based on an attribute of said demand entry, said selecting performed by said logic unit,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: logic unit 22 of Figure 2; page 6, lines 15-27; matching process 70 of Figure 4; and page 9, line 13 - page 11 line 18 which describe matching and the role of logic unit 22; and page 11, lines 15-18 which describe automatic matching. “[A]utomatically booking said selected carrier entry in response to said demand entry, said booking performed by said logic unit,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: page 4, line 29-page 5, line 6 and page 14, line 27-page 15, line 3 which describe automatic booking. “[W]herein said partner databases belong to partner exchange entities that are distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system, are registered with said integrated exchange computer, maintain information regarding shipping demand or carrier information separate from said database, and provide access to said information to said integrated exchange computer via an application program interface of said information exchange computer,” as recited in Claim 1, is described at least by: Claim 2 as originally filed; page 3, lines 16-27; Figure 1 which shows partner exchanges 14 (which include partner databases) as being distinct from integrated exchange computer 18; page 5, line 28 - page 6, line 10; application program interfaces 15-1 to 15-p of Figure 1; and page 6, lines 15-27 which discuss API 15 coupling with API 26 of integrated exchange computer 18.

Claim 34 depends from Claim 30. “[A]llowing a user to define a subgroup of shippers and carriers and granting unrestricted access to said database only to said subgroup,” as is recited in Claim 34, is described at least at: page 5, lines 16-27.

VI. Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Whether Claims 1, 3-19, 26-28, 30, 33-35 and 37-39 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hunt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,716; hereinafter “Hunt”) in view of Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,509; hereinafter “Williams”) and in further view of Thiel (U.S. Patent No 6,035,291, hereinafter “Thiel”).
2. Whether Claims 20-25, 29, 36 and 40-42 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hunt in view of Williams, and in further view of Nel (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0036935).
3. Whether “Official Notice” has been properly taken and utilized in the rejection of Claims 5 and 34 in view of Hunt and Official Notice.

VII. Argument

1. Whether Claims 1, 3-19, 26-28, 30, 33-35 and 37-39 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hunt in view of Williams and in further view of Theil.

Appellants have reviewed the above-cited art and the rejection in the instant Office Action (Office Action dated 6/23/2010) and respectfully submit that the embodiments as recited in Claims 1, 3-19, 26-28, 30, 33-35 and 37-39 are patentable over Hunt in view of Williams and Thiel for at least the following rationale.

“As reiterated by the Supreme Court in KSR, the framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual inquiries” including “[a]scertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art” (MPEP 2141(II)). “In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious” (emphasis in original; MPEP 2141.02(I)).

Independent Claim 1 recites the features (emphasis added):

An information exchange system comprising:
a link to a communication network coupled to at least one shipper user, at least one carrier user, and a plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability;

a database coupled to said link, said database storing a demand entry and a plurality of carrier entries that arrive to said database through said communication network, said demand entry comprising shipping demand specifications and said plurality of carrier entries comprising carrier availability information;

a logic unit coupled to said database, said logic unit receiving said demand entry, automatically selecting one of said plurality of carrier entries based on an attribute of said demand entry, and automatically booking said

selected carrier entry in response to said demand entry;

an application program interface coupled with said link and with said logic unit, said application program interface configured for allowing said logic unit to access said information related to carrier availability from said partner databases;

an integrated exchange computer of said information exchange system, said information exchange computer coupled with said link, wherein said database, said application program interface, and said logic unit are part of said integrated exchange computer; and

wherein said partner databases belong to partner exchange entities that are distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system, are registered with said integrated exchange computer, maintain information regarding shipping demand or carrier information separate from said database, and provide access to said information to said integrated exchange computer via said application program interface.

Claim 30 recites similar features. The Appellants submit that the features recited in independent Claims 1 and 30 are not rendered obvious by Hunt in view of Williams and/or Thiel. More specifically, neither Hunt, Williams, nor Thiel is understood to disclose (emphasis added)

... a link to a communication network coupled to at least one shipper user, at least one carrier user, and a plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability ... wherein said partner databases belong to partner exchange entities that are distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system, are registered with said integrated exchange computer, maintain information regarding shipping demand or carrier information separate from said database...

as is recited in Claim 1 and similarly in Claim 30.

The in paragraph 4a (pages 2-3), the instant Office Action states, "... Hunt discloses the use of a partner subsystem (9) with a request database, that is different from the transportation database, and which ports data to the centralized database, which stores demand specification information, See Claims 6-9, Column 4, lines 45-62." Appellants again disagree, and submit that Hunt does not disclose the use of a partner database as described in

Appellants' Claims 1 and 30. Instead, Appellants understand that Hunt discloses in column 4, lines 45-48 (emphasis added): "Subsystem 9 represents an input/output point at a carrier or shipper site that is porting data to centralized database 50 which can be administered by the carrier, shipper, or a third party." Appellants submit that viewing Figure 1 of Hunt in conjunction with the text of col. 4, lines 24-62 of shows that subsystems 8 and 9 of system 10 are merely input/output points that are coupled with a central database 50.

While Claims 6-9 of Hunt mention both a transportation database and a request database, Appellants submit that Hunt's provides no context for where these databases are located and does not specify if these databases are separate from the central database 50 or a part of central database 50. Moreover, Hunt is silent with respect to whether these databases mentioned in claims 6-9 (or any database mentioned in Hunt) is a partner database that belongs to a partner exchange entity that is distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system, as is described in Claims 1 and 30. Appellants submit that there is no support for the instant Office Action's contention in paragraph 4a (pages 2-3) that subsystem 9 includes or is used with a request database or that the request database of Hunt is separate from database 50 of Hunt. Additionally, the Appellants submit that one skilled in the art would not equate an input/output point as disclosed by Hunt with the partner databases recited in Claims 1 and 30. To that end, Appellants submit that Hunt is silent with respect to partner databases, links thereto, or receipt of information there from, as are described in Claims 1 and/or 30.

Moreover, these contentions of the instant Office Action with respect to subsystem 9 being a partner subsystem with a request database appear to be conclusory, and per MPEP

2141(III), “[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness,” emphasis added. *In re Kahn*, 441 F. 3d 977, 988 as cited by *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR)*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d at 1396 (2007). As there is no articulated reasoning supporting these discussed contentions of the Office Action, Appellants submit that Hunt does not teach, suggest, or otherwise render obvious “... a plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability ... wherein said partner databases belong to partner exchange entities that are distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system,” as recited in Claim 1 and similarly in Claim 30. Instead, Appellants submit that Hunt is silent with respect to partner databases, links thereto, or receipt of information there from, as are described in Claims 1 and/or 30.

The Appellants submit that Williams and Thiel both fail to overcome the shortcomings of Hunt. The Appellants do not understand Williams or Thiel, alone or in combination with one another and/or Hunt, to disclose “... a plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability ... wherein said partner databases belong to partner exchange entities that are distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system,” as recited in Claims 1 and 30.

In paragraph 4c (page 3), the instant Office Action indicates that “Databases are simply a collection of data. Therefore who the database belongs to is not considered to be functional to the system.” Appellants respectfully disagree with any contention that the location of a database, the information of a database, and/or the ownership of a database

is/are non-functional to a system as these factors may indeed define and control both the structure and function of a system.

Therefore, the Appellants submit that Hunt alone, or in combination with Williams and/or Thiel, fails to teach or suggest all of the features of Claim 1 or Claim 30. Furthermore, the Rejection fails to explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least the foregoing rationale, Appellants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 30 are patentable over Hunt in view of Williams and in further view of Thiel, and that these claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 3-19 and 26-28 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional features descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Claims 33-35 and 37-39 depend from Claim 30 and recite additional features descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Appellants submit that Claims 3-19, 26-28, 33-35 and 37-39 are in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable base claims. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections of these claims.

2. Whether Claims 20-25, 29, 36 and 40-42 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hunt in view of Williams and in further view of Nel.

Appellants have reviewed the above-cited art and respectfully submit that the embodiments as recited in Claims 20-25, 29, 36 and 40-42 are patentable over Hunt in view of Williams, and in further view of Nel for at least the following rationale.

Claims 20-25 and 29 are dependent on independent Claim 1 and include the features of Claim 1. Claims 36 and 40-42 are dependent on independent Claim 30 and include the features of Claim 30. As described above, Appellants submit that neither Hunter nor the combination of Hunter in view of Williams teaches or suggests the features of Appellants' Claims 1 and 30. The Appellants submit that Nel fails to overcome the shortcomings of Hunt in view of Williams.

More specifically, neither Nel, nor Hunt in view of Williams and further in view of Nel, teaches, suggests, or otherwise renders obvious "... a plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability ... wherein said partner databases belong to partner exchange entities that are distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system," as is recited in Claim 1 and similarly in Claim 30. Instead, Nel also appears to be silent to such features that involve partner databases.

For at least the foregoing rationale, Appellants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is not supported by Hunt in view of Williams and further in view of Nel. Claims 20-25 and 29 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional features descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Appellants submit that the rejection of Claims 20-25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are also not supported by the cited art. Claims 36 and 40-42 depend from Claim 30 and recite additional features descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Appellants submit that the rejection of Claims 36 and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are also not supported by the cited art. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejections of these claims.

3. Whether “Official Notice” has been properly taken and utilized in the rejection of Claims 5 and 34 in view of Hunt and Official Notice.

With respect to Claims 5 and 34, the instant Office Action states on page 10, section 30 that:

Hunt ... fails to disclose the logic unit allows a user to define a subgroup within the exchange system, and assign unrestricted access to only members of the subgroup. The examiner takes official notice that the use of defining a group who has unrestricted access to the system is old and well known in the art.

Appellants submit that without the supplement provided by this Official Notice, Claims 5 and 35 would be allowable over Hunt. Appellants further submit that this taking of Official Notice is improper as it: 1) amounts to improper conclusory reasoning; and 2) has not been supported in the manner outlined by 37 CFR § 1.104(d)(2).

By only generally referring to features of Windows® network products, not providing citations of support for these generalizations, and not relating such art to Appellants’ claims, Appellants respectfully submit that the instant Office Action has provided inadequate support of a finding of Official Notice. Appellants are not disputing that Windows® network products may have such features. Rather, Appellants are disputing that it is not proper to take Official Notice of such a general topic and then use a conclusory line of reasoning to reject as obvious a feature of Appellants’ system, which is claimed in a very particularized manner in comparison to the generalized finding of the Official Notice. As previously discussed, per MPEP 2141(III), “[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness,” emphasis added. Appellants are merely requesting that the Office Action supply some articulated reasoning to

link the Official Notice to Appellants claimed system of Claim 5 (which would include all of the features of Claim 1).

The Office Action appears to be attempting to shift the burden of response to the Appellants prior to and without satisfying the Office's initial burden of citation of support and a rejection with articulated reasoning. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the Board require the Office to provide adequate evidence in the form of articulated reasoning and an affidavit in support of the finding of Official Notice, in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.104(d)(2), a citation which supports the Official Notice, or require the Office to withdraw the Official Notice rejections with respect to Claims 5 and 34.

Conclusion

The Appellants believe that pending Claims 1, 3-30, and 33-42 are patentable over the cited art. Appellants respectfully request that the Board reverse the rejection of Claims 1, 3-30, and 33-42.

The Appellants wish to encourage the Examiner or a member of the Board of Patent Appeals to telephone the Appellants' undersigned representative if it is felt that a telephone conference could expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: November 30, 2010

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration No.: 35,398

WAGNER BLECHER LLP
Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076

Phone: (408) 377-0500

VIII. Appendix - Clean Copy of Claims on Appeal

1. An information exchange system comprising:

a link to a communication network coupled to at least one shipper user, at least one carrier user, and a plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability;

a database coupled to said link, said database storing a demand entry and a plurality of carrier entries that arrive to said database through said communication network, said demand entry comprising shipping demand specifications and said plurality of carrier entries comprising carrier availability information;

a logic unit coupled to said database, said logic unit receiving said demand entry, automatically selecting one of said plurality of carrier entries based on an attribute of said demand entry, and automatically booking said selected carrier entry in response to said demand entry;

an application program interface coupled with said link and with said logic unit, said application program interface configured for allowing said logic unit to access said information related to carrier availability from said partner databases;

an integrated exchange computer of said information exchange system, said information exchange computer coupled with said link, wherein said database, said application program interface, and said logic unit are part of said integrated exchange computer; and

wherein said partner databases belong to partner exchange entities that are distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system, are registered with said integrated exchange computer, maintain information regarding shipping demand or carrier information separate from said database, and provide access to said information to

said integrated exchange computer via said application program interface.

3. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said logic unit notifies a user when one of a demand entry and a carrier entry is received.

4. The information exchange system of claim 1, further comprising an Enterprise Resource Planning system that forwards shipping demand specifications and carrier availability information to said database.

5. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said logic unit allows a user to define a subgroup within said exchange system and to limit unrestricted access of at least a portion of said database only to members of said subgroup.

6. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said demand entry comprises a request for a demand report containing at least a portion of shipping demand specifications.

7. The information exchange system of claim 6, wherein said demand entry further comprises a criterion said logic unit uses to decide entries to include in said demand report.

8. The information exchange system of claim 6, wherein said communication network is the Internet and said demand report comprises hyperlinks to other reports containing at least one of a shipping demand specification and carrier availability

information.

9. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said demand entry comprises a carrier availability report containing at least one entry comprising carrier availability information stored in said database.

10. The information exchange system of claim 9, wherein said demand entry further comprises a criterion said logic unit uses to decide entries to include in said carrier availability report.

11. The information exchange system of claim 9, wherein communication network is the Internet and said carrier availability report comprises hyperlinks to other reports containing details of carrier availability information.

12. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said shipping demand specification comprises at least one of a route, a point of origin, a destination, a vehicle type, date(s) of availability, cargo dimensions, cargo weight, cargo content, and an offer price.

13. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said carrier availability information comprises at least one of carrier mobile unit routes, point of origin, destination, vehicle type, date(s) of availability, cargo dimensions, cargo weight, cargo content, and a price.

14. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said logic unit alerts a

user when one or more parameters of a shipping demand entry match one or more parameters of a carrier availability entry.

15. The information exchange system of claim 14, wherein said logic unit provides a user with an option to make capacity-based arrangements.

16. The information exchange system of claim 14, wherein said logic unit provides a user with an option to conduct a transaction over said communication network.

17. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said demand entry identifies at least one demand entry, and wherein said response comprises a match report listing carrier entries having parameters that at least partially match the parameters of the identified demand entry.

18. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said demand entry identifies at least one carrier availability entry and said response comprises a match report listing shipping demand entries having parameters that at least partially match the parameters of the identified carrier availability entry.

19. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said demand entry comprises one of an implied request and an express request for said logic unit to store received information in said database.

20. The information exchange system of claim 1, further comprising a fleet

monitoring system that monitors locations of delivery vehicles.

21. The information exchange system of claim 20, wherein said logic unit alerts a delivery vehicle when a new demand entry matches a location of said delivery vehicle as determined by said fleet monitoring system.

22. The information exchange system of claim 20, wherein each of said delivery vehicles contains a GPS unit and a wireless modem that transmits location data for each of said delivery vehicles to said fleet monitoring system.

23. The information exchange system of claim 22, wherein said wireless modem provides an Internet connection to the fleet monitoring system.

24. The information exchange system of claim 20, wherein at least one of said delivery vehicles contains a portal allowing a driver to see demands from the database.

25. The information exchange system of claim 20, wherein a GPS unit and a wireless modem in one of said delivery vehicles automatically transmit location data for said delivery vehicle to the fleet monitoring system, and the logic uses the location data in determining whether to send an alert to the delivery vehicle.

26. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said logic unit formulates said response when a new entry is received.

27. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said logic unit formulates said response at a predetermined time interval.

28. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said response is a business analysis report comprising at least one of said demand entries and said carrier entries entered into said database during a selected date range and details of transactions relating to said entries.

29. The information exchange system of claim 1, wherein said shipping demand specification comprises an offer price and said carrier availability information comprises a bid price, and wherein said logic unit arranges a transaction between a shipper and a carrier based on the difference between said offer price and said bid price.

30. A method comprising:

receiving a demand entry from at least one of a first shipper user of an integrated exchange system or one of a plurality of partner databases, said demand entry comprising shipping demand specifications, said demand entry received by a logic unit of an integrated exchange computer of said integrated exchange system;

receiving a first carrier entry from a carrier user of said integrated exchange system and second carrier entry from at least one of said plurality of partner databases, said plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability, said carrier entries received by said logic unit, said carrier entries comprising carrier availability information;

storing said received demand entry and said received carrier entries in a database comprising a plurality of carrier entries, wherein said database is a part of said integrated

exchange computer;

automatically selecting one of said plurality of carrier entries based on an attribute of said demand entry, said selecting performed by said logic unit;

automatically booking said selected carrier entry in response to said demand entry, said booking performed by said logic unit; and

wherein said partner databases belong to partner exchange entities that are distinct from said carrier and shipper users of said information exchange system, are registered with said integrated exchange computer, maintain information regarding shipping demand or carrier information separate from said database, and provide access to said information to said integrated exchange computer via an application program interface of said information exchange computer.

33. The method of claim 30, wherein said database receives at least one of a request and an entry from Enterprise Resource Planning system.

34. The method of claim 30, further comprising allowing a user to define a subgroup of shippers and carriers and granting unrestricted access to said database only to said subgroup.

35. The method of claim 30, further comprising comparing parameters of said received demand entry or of said received carrier entries to demand or carrier entries in said database and notifying said user if parameters of said received demand entry or received carrier entry at least partially match the parameters of at least one of said carrier entries or of at least one of said demand entries in said database.

36. The method of claim 35, wherein said received demand entry comprises an offer price and said received carrier entries comprises a bid price, further comprising executing a transaction over a communication network between a first user who entered said offer price and a second user who entered said bid price.

37. The method of claim 35, further comprising providing a user with at least one of matching demand specifications and matching availability information.

38. The method of claim 30, wherein said demand entry comprises at least one criterion and wherein said response comprises at least one entry that meets said criterion.

39. The method of claim 30, wherein said received demand entry or said received carrier entries comprises at least one of a route, a point of origin, a destination, a vehicle type, a date of availability, cargo dimensions, cargo weight, cargo content, and a price.

40. The method of claim 30, further comprising monitoring locations of delivery vehicles.

41. The method of claim 39, further comprising alerting a delivery vehicle when the location of said delivery vehicle matches a parameter of a demand entry.

42. The method of claim 39, wherein said delivery vehicle comprises a location determining unit and a wireless communication device connected to a communication

network.

IX. Evidence Appendix

No evidence is herein appended.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

No related proceedings.